

**District of Columbia
Public Schools
System
(DCPS)**

DC Public Schools, Special Study, FY 2006

Purpose

The District of Columbia Council requested for the 2006 budget submission that the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) include a study of expenditures of federal grants, with a focus on Title I grant funds, as compared to the federal grant expenditures of school systems of comparable size and demographics. The years for consideration are fiscal years (FY) 2002, 2003, and 2004. The numbers suggest that DCPS has less total federal grant expenditures than the other school systems used for this comparison, but are much more aligned in regards to Title I grant expenditures.

Title I grant funding by the U.S. Government is an extremely important source of funding for many school systems in the United States. With the passing of The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in January of 2002, the most comprehensive revision of federal education programs since the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 took place. One of the NCLB programs is Title I funding, along with Reading First, Improving Teacher Quality Grants, English Language Acquisition, and other smaller programs like supporting charter schools and Safe and Drug-Free School and Communities programs. Title I grants is the largest K-12 program, which provides billions of Dollars to local school districts nationwide to improve the academic achievement of children in high-poverty schools.

Selected Schools

The selection of schools for the purpose this study was based on comparable pupil enrollment numbers and similar demographics of that population. The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) provides “peer districts” based on those criteria. These school systems include Oakland, CA, Atlanta City, GA, Indianapolis, MN, Orleans Parish, LA, Boston, MA, Baltimore City, MD, St. Louis City, MO, Newark City, NJ, Buffalo City, NY, Cincinnati City, OH, Cleveland Municipal, OH, Columbus City, OH, Oklahoma City, OK, Tulsa, OK, El Paso, TX, Fort Worth, TX, San Antonio, TX, Ysleta, TX, and Milwaukee, WI.

The four schools chosen from this group, Baltimore City, MD, Boston, MA, Columbus, OH, and Cleveland, OH, are the four school systems that are closest to DCPS enrollment numbers of between 60,000 and 70,000, with the exception of Baltimore, which was chosen primarily because of the close proximity of this neighboring urban school district. The level of Title I funding depends on the proportion of pupils eligible for the Free and Reduced Lunch program. It is the measure of poverty used by the U.S. Department of Education, therefore, this value is provided as a percentage of total enrollment.

Table I Enrollment Data

School System	2002		2003		2004	
	Enrollment	% FRL*	Enrollment	% FRL	Enrollment	% FRL
District of Columbia	63,740	64.4	66,072	61.6	65,099	63.0
Baltimore City	95,475	81.5	94,035	83.0	91,738	81.2
Boston, MA	62,739	71.0	62,102	74.0	60,164	74.0
Columbus, OH	63,628	57.3	63,000	64.0	62,201	66.0
Cleveland, OH	72,898	62.7	71,613	62.7	69,559	61.0

* FRL = Students eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch

According to the U.S. Department of Education’s Fact Sheet on Title I, Part A of August 2002 available on the USED website, as of Federal FY 2002 a total of 47,600 schools are qualified as Title I schools. This number represents 58% of all public schools, or 67% of all elementary schools, or 29% of all secondary schools. The majority of the Title I funding (46%) goes to the highest-poverty schools, which are classified as having 75% + of the students are eligible for free and reduced lunches. Schools with eligibility rates between 50% and 74% receive 27% of all Title I funding allotted from the Federal Government. Interestingly, an equal amount of funding (27%) goes to schools with 50% or less eligibility rate, possibly attributed to the larger number of those schools. The District of Columbia exceeds this national trend with allocating 60% of its Title I funding to schools considered highest-poverty, 30% going to schools with between 50% and 74% poverty rate, and the remaining 10% being allocated to schools with a rate lower than 50%.

In the comparison undertaken here, the City of Baltimore falls under the highest-poverty schools with an average of 82% of pupils receiving free and reduced lunch benefits, and Boston bordering that classification with an average of 73%. DCPS, Columbus, and Cleveland are very comparable in their respective pupil poverty rate.

Federal Grant Funds Expenditures

The information provided in the tables refers to the total federal grants expenditures the individual school system incurred, the total for the group of Title I grants, as well as the expenditures of those subcategories under Title I grants. Sources used for the information are the Schedule(s) of Expenditures of Federal Grants contained in the respective school system's A-133 audit reports, or some other type of summary of federal funding provided by the schools' Finance Office available at the time. City of Columbus, OH, Public Schools were unable to provide FY 2004 information due to current discrepancies still under investigation with the auditors. They were hesitant to provide pre-audit information.

Title I grant funding consists of several program areas each assigned a separate CFDA number. Some are grants directly awarded to the Local Education Agencies (LEA), while other program grants are issued to the State Education Agencies (SEA) only and are not flowed-down to the LEA level. Examples are Migrant Education grants (CFDA 84.011), Even Start Grants (CFDA 84.213), and Advanced Placement grants (CFDA 84.303A) and State Assessment and Accountability (CFDA 84.369). While DCPS as a school district receives those SEA grants and they are listed in the A-133 audit reports' Schedule of Federal Grant Expenditures, they cannot be listed when comparing to other school systems that have a clear separation between City and State administration. Accordingly, the table below will list only such Title I grants that are received by the LEA. This is an important distinction to make, in order to compare with other school systems that are unlike Washington, DC with LEA and SEA under one roof.

It is important to note that the expenditures and awards for each fiscal year include carryover funding.

FY 2002	DCPS	Baltimore City	Boston, MA	Columbus, OH	Cleveland, OH
Total Federal Grant Expenditures	\$45,969,773	\$48,104,743	\$117,137,481	\$59,550,214	\$101,447,980
Total Title I Funding	\$32,509,012	\$42,578,188	\$ 31,656,364	\$23,365,401	\$ 33,986,375
Grants to LEA - Part A 84.010	\$30,991,668	\$41,092,930	\$ 28,600,749	\$22,344,398	\$ 32,685,529
Neglected and Delinquent Children – Part D	\$ 199,656	\$ 297,779	\$ 214,049	\$ 0	\$ 0

84.013					
Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration – Part F 84.332	\$ 851,509	\$ 0	\$ 699,800	\$ 736,960	\$ 387,059
Title I Accountability Grants 84.348	\$ 466,179	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 284,043	\$ 0
Reading First – Part B 84.357A	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Title I Capital Reimbursement	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 389,874	\$ 0	\$ 385,500
School Improvement – Part C	\$ 0	\$ 1,187,479	\$ 1,751,892	\$ 0	\$ 528,287

FY 2003	DCPS	Baltimore City	Boston, MA	Columbus, OH	Cleveland, OH
Total Federal Grant Expenditures	\$62,009,811	\$65,727,690	\$136,226,084	\$66,821,165	\$131,287,325
Total Title I Funding	\$33,374,271	\$49,901,692	\$ 40,616,782	\$24,925,825	\$ 43,561,754
Grants to LEA – Part A 84.010	\$31,784,734	\$49,534,162	\$ 38,667,346	\$23,920,683	\$ 43,417,194
Neglected and Delinquent Children – Part D 84.013	\$ 393,356	\$ 367,530	\$ 204,196	\$ 0	\$ 0
Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration – Part F 84.332	\$ 773,165	\$ 0	\$ 1,582,740	\$ 825,521	\$ 165,504
Title I Accountability Grants 84.348	\$ 423,016	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 179,621	\$ 0
Reading First – Part B 84.357A	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
Title I Capital Reimbursement	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 15,975
School Improvement – Part C	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 152,500	\$ 0	\$ (36,919)

Title I Program Improvement	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 10,000	\$ 0	\$ 0
-----------------------------	------	------	-----------	------	------

FY 2004	DCPS	Baltimore City	Boston, MA	Columbus, OH Unavailable	Cleveland, OH
Total Federal Grant Expenditures	\$72,310,385	\$61,001,710	\$130,364,940		\$125,438,475
Total Title I Funding	\$45,542,565	\$51,599,578	\$ 46,139,171		\$ 53,563,677
Grants to LEA – Part A 84.010	\$42,842,122	\$50,375,334	\$ 44,556,431		\$ 48,803,122
Neglected and Delinquent Children – Part D 84.013	\$ 102,373	\$ 445,220	\$ 0		\$ 0
Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration – Part F 84.332	\$ 422,792	\$ 0	\$ 1,582,740		\$ 597,406
Title I Accountability Grants 84.348	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0		\$ 0
Reading First-Part B 84.357A	\$ 2,175,278	\$ 0	\$ 0		\$ 4,163,149
School Improvement – Part C	\$ 0	\$ 779,024	\$ 0		\$ 0

Description of Title I Programs

Title I, Part A is a basic grant to LEAs that provides funding to help ensure that all children have the opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach proficiency on challenging state academic standards and assessments. Title I provides flexibility funding that may be used to provide additional instructional staff, professional development, extended-time programs, and other strategies for raising student achievement in high-poverty schools. ***The Neglected and Delinquent Children*** provides financial assistance to educational programs for youths in state-operated institutions or community day programs. The Neglected and Delinquent program also provides financial assistance to support school districts' programs involving collaboration with locally operated correctional facilities. ***Reading First*** is intended to ensure that all states and school districts with the highest number of percentage of K-3 students reading below grade level can read at grade level or above by the end of third grade through the implementation of instructional programs and material, assessments, professional development grounded in scientifically based reading research. ***Comprehensive School Reform*** grants are

intended to build upon existent Title I school-wide program, which provides greater flexibility in the use of federal funds and encourages the implementation of effective strategies for all students in a school. The CSRD program provides start-up financial assistance to schools so that they can implement whole school reforms that reflect the research content of effective practices in order to help students meet state academic standards.

Highlights and Comments on Data

Comparing total federal grant expenditures between DCPS, Boston, Columbus, and Cleveland, DCPS seems to spend markedly less in total grant funds. Baltimore's total federal grant expenditures are very close to those of DCPS, and are actually lower in FY 2004.

For FY 2002, DCPS total federal grant expenditures shows \$46 million. This compares to Baltimore's \$48 million, Boston's \$117 million, Columbus' \$59.5 million, and Cleveland's \$101.5 million. DCPS' level of expenditures expressed as percentage of the figures for the comparable schools are 96%, 39%, 77%, and 45%, respectively, of those levels. FY 2003 shows a similar picture, with the exception of Columbus, which in that year has a similar level of total grant expenditures as DCPS and Baltimore: DCPS \$62 million, Baltimore \$65.7 million, Boston \$136 million, Columbus \$66.8 million, and Cleveland \$131 million. DCPS' level of expenditures expressed as a percentage variance are 94%, 46%, 93%, and 47%, respectively. Grant expenditures for FY 2004 show DCPS at \$72.3 million, Baltimore \$61 million, Boston \$130.3 million, and Cleveland \$125.4 million. The DCPS percentage comparison for that FY is 119%, 55%, and 58%, respectively. Note again that Columbus couldn't provide FY04 information.

Noteworthy is Boston's general rule regarding grant funding to expend in full. An internal policy does not allow for carry-over of funds into the subsequent fiscal year. According to the Director of the Development Office for Boston Public Schools, carry-over is considered a bad business practice and all grant funds are completely expended. DCPS, Columbus, and Cleveland allow for carry-overs, whereas Cleveland, if at all, attempts to have 5-7% and no more than 15% of prior fiscal year grant awards carried forward. This essentially means that award data equals annual expenditures for Cleveland. Boston stated that the 27 months period of performance allowed by the Tydings Amendment to formula type grants benefits at the State level where up to 15% of the funds can be carried forward. However, any allocation made by the SEA to the LEA is expected to cover one fiscal year only.

Comparing total Title I program expenditures, grant amounts seem to be on a slight but steady increasing trend for all school systems despite the generally declining trend of enrollment for city schools. Particularly for Baltimore and Boston the Title I funding is higher compared to DCPS due to their higher rate of free and reduced lunch program participants. Unlike the differences of total federal grant expenditures between the schools in question, with Title I a much more closely aligned funding level can be observed. This is directly attributable to the U.S. Department of Education based on

poverty-rate at the school districts, whereas the federal grant funds available overall are likely more the result of choices made by the schools' administration.

The U.S. Department of Education's Fact Sheet on Title I, Part A of August 2002 states that 77% of support is used for instruction related expenditures, 12% for instructional support, and 12% for administration expenditures based on school year 1997-1998 information for all U.S. school districts. This U.S. average compares to DCPS' use of 5% of the LEA's Title I funds administration of its Title I programs.

Looking at Boston's grant expenditures it is worth noting that they do not apply for grants for the Even Start program, and the Migrant Education grant does not flow down to the LEA level, but remains in full at the State level. DCPS no longer receives Title I Accountability Grants. However, the DCPS-SEA receives funding under Title VI for state assessment and accountability programs.